REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the July 6, 2009 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment D amends claims 1, 14, 25, 29, 31 and 35. Claims 6, 10, 18, 26 and 33 have been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9, 11-17, 19-25, 28-31 and 34-36 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-7, 9-26, 28-31, 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cadiz et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0186257 A1) in view of Jobs et al. (Pub. No. US 2005/0149879 A1). Applicants respectfully submit that neither Cadiz nor Jobs, alone or in combination, render these claims unpatentable.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a method for, among other things, providing a user interaction scheme, said method comprising "minimizing the application upon receiving a minimize command **to a rich minimized application (RMA)**, said minimizing including **hiding a taskbar application button** associated with the application, **said RMA comprising a restore option** allowing the user to restore the application ".

Cadiz describes a system and method for providing peripheral awareness of information to a user. A peripheral awareness display is provided that hosts items comprising a ticker (XML data file) and a specialized viewer. Items only exist within the context of containers or sidebars (See FIG. 5 of Cadiz). Jobs teaches a computing system that manages the amount of information presented at one time to a user by **removing non-active windows** from view (at least paragraph [0002] of Jobs). The docking area of Jobs merely resembles a taskbar as seen in the prior art and described by the Applicants, and not the interactive sidebar of the current invention, wherein a user can still invoke some functionality of the application when in a minimized/docked state. Jobs hence teaches away from the Applicant's invention. The Applicant's claimed invention is specific to applications **capable of both stand-alone operation**

(accessible in an application window, and via the task bar) as well as providing a rich minimized application (RMA) in a sidebar as disclosed. None of the applications of Cadiz are capable of stand-alone operation due to a rigid tie-in with the ticket + viewer construction of all the items displayed as thumbnails, and as a result are not visible via the taskbar. Programming of RMA aspects of stand alone applications to interface with a sidebar to provide interactivity involved significant development work by the Applicants, as evidenced by FIG. 2A of Applicant's specifications.

As admitted by the Examiner, Cadiz does not disclose minimizing the application and revealing a tile in the sidebar, and accordingly Cadiz cannot anticipate that the minimized application (or RMA) has a restore option. As stated above, Jobs merely teaches a docking system akin to a taskbar, and does not provide application functionality through an RMA. Neither Jobs nor Cadiz, alone or in combination, teach a restore option that not only involves restoring the full functionality of the application but also the ability to switch docking of the restored application from the sidebar to the taskbar.

In the related rejection of claim 6 (now canceled), the Office argues that Jobs teaches the docking area which manages the positions of minimized representations, and that "it is well-known in the art that the taskbar is used to identify windows which are active including both those which are maximized and minimized". However, the subject matter of claim 6, which is included in independent claim 1 now, explicitly stated that **the taskbar application button was hidden on the taskbar upon minimizing**, thereby teaching away from the cited art. This feature ties in with the concept of RMAs as recited in the claims, where the RMAs are minimized to the sidebar rather than the taskbar. The sidebar is configured to interface RMAs to expose their interactivity and functionality as claimed; none of Cadiz or Jobs teaches this feature.

In the related rejection of claim 10 (now canceled), the Office argues that Jobs teaches providing the user with a restore button accessible through the tile to allow the user to maximize the application. Applicants respectfully submit that Jobs functionally teaches a taskbar, and not the sidebar of the Applicants claims that is capable of hosting RMAs and exposing their functionality as claimed. Taskbars, as known to one of skill in the art, typically do not need a separate restore option since the user can

restore the application to active status just by clicking on the minimized application icon. The Applicant's Specification (paragraph [0073]), on the other hand, teaches various enhancements for implementing the restore option, such as a hover button next to the RMA tile and a 'remove from bar' option.

Hence, for all the reasons stated above, claim 1 is distinguishable over the cited art. Claims 4-5, 7, 9, and 11-13 depend from allowable claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as stated above.

Amended independent claim 14 recites a method in a computing system for providing a user interaction scheme through the use of a sidebar, said method comprising, among other things, "moving an application to the sidebar upon receipt of a user command to minimize the application based on the request **to a rich minimized application (RMA)**, said minimizing including **hiding a taskbar application button** associated with the application, said RMA comprising **a restore option allowing the user to restore the application..**". The Office asserts that combining Cadiz and Jobs would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the above language distinguishes over the combined references. In addition, since amended claim 14 recites similar limitations to claim 1, it is also allowable for the same reasons set forth for claim 1 above.

Claims 15-24 depend from allowable claim 14, and are allowable for the same reasons as stated above.

Amended independent claim 25 recites a system comprising, among other things, a processor for generating a sidebar of a user interface for displaying a plurality of tiles "wherein **each of the tiles represents a rich minimized application (RMA)** and includes a sub-set of live-data provided by an application and a sub-set of interactive application features provided by the application, said **RMA further comprising a restore option**" and an insertion module "**further comprising hiding a taskbar application button associated with the application**". The Office asserts that combining Cadiz and Jobs would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that since amended claim 25 recites similar limitations to claim 1, it is also allowable for the same reasons set forth for claim 1 above.

Claims 28-30 depend from allowable claim 25, and are allowable for the same reasons as stated above.

Amended independent claim 31 recites a system for providing access to a minimized email application through a user interface that includes "minimization of the email application **to a rich minimized application (RMA)**" and "a tile insertion module for revealing **a tile corresponding to the RMA, said RMA comprising a restore option**, and for displaying the selected interactive features in the tile in response to minimization of the email application, said **displaying including hiding a taskbar application button associated with the application**". The Office asserts that combining Cadiz and Jobs would meet the claimed limitations for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that since amended claim 31 recites similar limitations to claim 1, it is also allowable for the same reasons set forth for claim 1 above.

Claims 34-36 depend from allowable claim 31, and are allowable for the same reasons as stated above.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-5, 7, 9, 11-17, 19-25, 28-31 and 34-36 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the claims. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/DXS/dss